

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 6-8, 19-23, 25-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sun in view of Shiimoto. Claim 1 now comprises a second block to process a second type of frame in the video bit stream using a second error resilience technique, wherein the first error resilience technique is different from the second error resilience technique such that the second resilience technique replaces a bit pattern for the second type of frame with a shorter length pit pattern.

The Sun reference fails to disclose use of first and second error resilience techniques with the respective first and second blocks, as noted by the Examiner. It is suggested that the Shiimoto reference discloses an error concealment apparatus with differing error resiliency techniques based differing code strings in order to re-enforce error-correcting abilities.

There is no teaching of a second error resilience technique which replaces a bit pattern for the second type of frame with a shorter length code. Therefore, the Sun and Shiimoto references, whether considered together or separately, fail to render claim 1 limitations *prima facie* obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the pertinent art. Accordingly, reconsideration for the Section 103 rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested because amended claim 1 is now in condition for allowance.

Claim 19 is amended to include a second block to process a second type of frame in the encoded video bit stream using a second error concealment technique, wherein the first error concealment technique is different from the second concealment technique such that the second error concealment technique copies the lost data from a previous second type of frame. The combination of the Sun and Shiimoto references fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 19 as a whole. Therefore, claim 19 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art. Thus, allowance of claim 19 is respectfully requested accordingly.

Claims 3-5, 9, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Sun reference in view of the Shiimoto reference and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,552,673 to Webb. The apparatus of claim 3 calls for a second block that comprises a resynchronization marking block. The Examiner acknowledges that the Sun and Shiimoto reference combination fails to disclose the use of application of resynchronization markers. However, the Examiner cites to the Webb reference for this teaching.

Webb merely teaches a different recording technique for RVLC for reversible variable length code words of a type implemented for H.263++ and MPEG-4 standards. This method for RVLC decoding by Webb fails to indicate use of a resynchronization marking block where different error resilience techniques for different types of frames are used. Absent this teaching, the Webb reference in combination or separately, with the Sun and Shiimoto references fails to teach or suggest claim 3. Accordingly, reconsideration of the Section 103 rejection of claim 3 is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Sun reference in view of the Shiimoto and Webb references. However, the Sun reference, even incorporating the Shiimoto's differing error resiliency techniques for the first and second type of frames, fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 10, as amended absent a teaching for resynchronization markers application. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to allow claim 10 and the claims depending therefrom. The Examiner is respectfully requested to consider all pending claims.

In view of these remarks and amendments, the application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 7, 2004



Timothy N. Trop
Registration No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Customer No.: 21906